

Appl. No. 09/763,049
Atty. Docket No. 7253L
Amdt. dated 12/3/2007
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 18-23 are currently pending in the application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claim 18 has been amended to further clarify the invention.

Claims 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,746,776 to Smith *et al.* ("Smith") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,547,476 to Siklosi *et al.* ("Siklosi"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Office Action, on page 3, alleges that "[b]ased on the teachings of Siklosi *et al.*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a dryer sheet with the dimensions and amount of composition taught by Siklosi *et al.* in the dry cleaning process of Smith *et al.*" Applicants submit that there would be no motivation to combine the teachings of Siklosi with those of Smith due to the order of magnitude difference in the surface areas disclosed between these patents.

The disclosure in Smith alleges teaches a bag for the cleaning and containment of soiled fabric articles. *See*, Smith, Abstract. As illustrated in Smith, the bag of Smith contained an 18' by 18' non-woven sheet. *See*, Smith, col. 9, lines 35-45. The sheet of Smith has an area of over 4180 cm² ($[18\text{in} \times 2.54\text{cm/in}]^2 \times 2$). In contrast, the area of the sheet disclosed in Siklosi is 625 cm². The sheet in Siklosi would need to be multiplied by a factor six in order to provide for a similar sized sheet. Combining the disclosure of Smith and Siklosi would render each ineffective for its purpose, as the huge discrepancy between sheet areas indicates. As such, Applicants submit that there is absolutely no motivation to combine the disclosures of Smith and Siklosi.

There is further lack of motivation to combine these disclosures. Smith teaches that its sheet is attached to its bag, as well as teaching that the dry-cleaning composition is added to the bag itself. *See, e.g.*, col. 9, lines 35-55. Siklosi, however teaches that the sheet or carrier is allowed "to tumble freely together." *See, e.g.*, Siklosi, col. 8, lines 10-15. Taking the sheet of Siklosi and utilizing it with Smith would render the inventions of Siklosi and Smith ineffective, as Smith requires that the sheet be attached to the bag and Siklosi requires that the sheet be free to tumble within the bag. As such, Applicants submit that there is absolutely no motivation to combine the disclosures of Smith and Siklosi.

Appl. No. 09/763,049
Atty. Docket No. 7253L
Amdt. dated 12/3/2007
Customer No. 27752

Finally, the office action suggests that suitable organic solvents cited in Smith include C2-C4 diols, ethylene glycol, and glycol ethers. While making no admissions and in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 18 to remove these compositions.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants to arrange for a telephonic interview in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the amendments herein. Should any fee be required, please charge such fee to Procter & Gamble Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Respectfully submitted,
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 

Mark A. Charles
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 51,547
Tel. No. (513) 627-4229

Dated: December 3, 2007
Customer Number: 27752